



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/334,510	06/21/1999	KOICHI ABE	1232-4544	5401

27123 7590 05/20/2005

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER

EBRAHIMI DEHKORDY, SAEID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/334,510	ABE, KOICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11, 17, 19-20 and 22- 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11, 17, 19-20 and 22- 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed Action/Response</u> |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues on page 3 lines 1-13 that there are two steps of scanning operation, first the when it detects that the scan head is mounted which is covered by the Oida et al on column 4 lines 33-42 where the scanning head or printing head is detected to be mounting by the host computer. And the second step which takes place when the original to be scanned is detected which is taught by Cotte on column 10 lines 39, where the original was sensed by the sensor 222 which triggers the scanning mechanism in the input device. The insertion of the paper also causes a code to be sent over the cable to the input device software resident on the host 210. While not a two step process, Oida et al in view of Cotte teaches the claimed invention ,

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 5-11,17,19-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oida et al (U.S. patent 5,987,186) in view of Cotte et al (U.S. patent 5,499,108)

Regarding claim 5,19 and 22 Oida et al disclose: A scanning system comprising:

Art Unit: 2626

a print device with a scanner function (please note column Fig.2 item 219, column 3 lines 58-65) which allows printing and scanning by selectively mounting a print head and a scan head on a head mounting portion (please note Fig.2 column 4 lines 33-37 where Oida et al teach the mounting of both print head and scan head selectively) wherein said print device includes a first detector configured to detect that said scan head is mounted on said head mounting portion (please note column 4 lines 33-38). However Oida et al do not disclose: and a second detector configured to detect an original to be scanned in the scanning; and an external computer which is connected to said print device to be able to communicate therewith, and comprises a scanner software for controlling scanning operation of print device, Wherein said print device communicates with said external computer to-start said scanner software when said first detector detects that said scan head is mounted on said head mounting portion, and to execute the scanning by said scan software when said second detector detects the original to be scanned in the scanning. On the other hand Cotte et al disclose: and a second detector configured to detect an original to be scanned in the scanning (please note Fig.12 item 222 the sensor, column 10 lines 28-31) and an external computer which is connected to said print device to be able to communicate therewith (please note Fig.12 item 210 the host or compute, column 10 lines 34-36) and comprises a scanner software for controlling scanning operation of print device (please note column 10 lines 35-39 where the software is in the host 210 to communicate with the printer) Wherein said print device communicates with said external computer to-start said scanner software (please note column 10 lines 28-39 where the insertion of the paper is

Art Unit: 2626

also causes the code to be sent over the cable to the input device software resident in the host 210) when said first detector detects that said scan head is mounted on said head mounting portion (as disclosed in the Oida et al where the scan head selectively mounted) and to execute the scanning by said scan software when said second detector detects the original to be scanned in the scanning (please note column 10 lines 35-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to modify Oida et al's invention according to the teaching of Cotte et al, where Cotte et al in the same filed of endeavor teach the way the sensor or detectors in the sense the insertion of the original and trigger a signal which activates the software in host to start scanning for the purpose of making the scanning faster and more efficient.

Regarding claim 6 Cotte et al disclose: The system according to claim 5, wherein said print device is designed to send a scanner start signal to said external computer (please note column 10 lines 28-34) said scanner software comprises a detection module for detecting the scanner start signal (please note column 10 lines 28-38) said detection module along in said scanner software is running in a standby state in which said print device has not been started as a scanner and modules other than said detection modules in said scanner software are started when said detection module detects the scanner start signal (please note column 10 lines 28-38). However Cotte et al do not disclose: when said scan head is mounted on said head mounting portion. On the other hand Oida et al disclose: when said scan head is mounted on said head mounting portion (please note column 4 lines 33-37). Therefore it would have been

Art Unit: 2626

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to modify Oida et al's invention according to the teaching of Cotte et al, where Cotte et al in the same filed of endeavor teach the way the sensor or detectors in the sense the insertion of the original and trigger a signal which activates the software in host to start scanning for the purpose of making the scanning faster and more efficient.

Regarding claim 7 Cotte et al disclose: The system according to claim 6, wherein when all the modules in said scanner software are running said detection module uses a sufficiently small work area of said external computer compared to other modules (please note column 10 lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 8 Oida et al disclose: The system according to claim 5, wherein said print head is an ink-jet print head (please note column 3 lines 57-65).

Regarding claim 11,20 and 23 Cotte et al disclose: A scanning system according to claim 5 wherein said external compute further comprises an application software which can edit an image scanned by said print device and said print device communicates with said external computer to transfer the read image to said application software (please note column 10 lines 35-40).

Regarding claim 9 Cotte et al disclose: The system according to claim 5, said scanner software further comprising a prescan selection module for selecting whether or not a prescan is made upon scanning the original and wherein when said scanner software is started and it is selected by said prescan selection module that the prescan is to be made an image of the original is prescanned and read into said scanner software. (please note column 10 lines 28-38).

Art Unit: 2626

Regarding claim 10 Kang discloses: The system according to claim 9, wherein said scanner software displays the pre-scanned and read image (please note column 10 lines 31-48).

Regarding claim 17 Cotte et al disclose: The system according to claim 11, wherein said scanner software comprises an application software run detection module for detecting whether or not said application software is running (please note column 10 lines 28-38).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Art Unit: 2626

- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy* whose telephone number is (571) 272-7462.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams, can be reached at (571) 272-7471.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, or (703) 308-9052 (for **formal** communications; please mark
"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")


Or:


(703) 306-5406 (for **informal** or **draft** communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Knox building on 501 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2626
May 9, 2005




KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER